

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

<b>TAB</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>DISCUSSION OF BOARD POLICY III.I ROLES AND MISSIONS</b>	Information Item
2	<b>RECONSIDERATION OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION STATEMENT</b>	Motion to Approve
3	<b>NEW INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT: THE MUSCULOSKELETAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE – BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	Motion to Approve
4	<b>HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS</b>	Motion to Approve
5	<b>NATIVE-AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE UPDATE</b>	Information Item
6	<b>IDAHO/WASHINGTON RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT</b>	Motion to Approve
7	<b>FEDERAL ACADEMIC COMPETITIVENESS GRANT PROGRAM – IDAHO'S PROPOSAL FOR A RIGOROUS HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM OF STUDY AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS ACCESS TO RETAIN TALENT (SMART) GRANTS</b>	Motion to Approve
8	<b>FIRST READING, DELETION OF BOARD POLICY III.D. OFFICIAL CALENDARS</b>	Motion to Approve

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Discussion of Board Policy III.I Roles and Missions

**APPLICABLE, RULE, STATUTE, POLICY**

- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.I. Roles and Missions
- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education - Planning and Coordination of Academic Programs and Courses

**BACKGROUND**

Per policy, the State Board of Education “adopts a formal statement of role and mission for each institution.” Any alteration must have Board approval.

Idaho State University (ISU) has developed a mission statement and included this statement into ISU’s Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan was adopted by the Board at their June 2007 meeting. ISU submitted the mission statement for review by the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) in September 2007 to promote their university. This mission statement and ISU’s current Board formal role and mission statement were not identical. CAAP forwarded this to the Board for review at their October 2007 meeting. Upon initial review, a question arose as to whether the Board had inadvertently approved two differing mission statements for ISU.

**DISCUSSION**

The Board considered if the proposed mission statement was intended to replace the formal “Mission and Scope” statement adopted by the Board or whether the mission statement was a separate statement.

**IMPACT**

Academic programming and planning are conducted toward alignment with the formal role and mission statements approved by the Board.

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Review of Board Policy III.I provides only contextual definitions for the terms scope, role, and mission. Board Policy III.Z utilizes the term “mission” over 60 times at various levels, such as “statewide mission” and “regional mission”. The Board has reserved the right to modify an institution’s statements concerning mission, role, and scope at any time.

Modification of Board Policy III.I and III.Z could provide the institutions with increased flexibility and responsibility for providing a mission statement that is consistent with formal Board statements and suitable for use in strategic planning and promotional documents. This would provide institutions with greater flexibility and improve the quality of strategic plans submitted for Board approval.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

**Idaho State Board of Education  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

**I. Roles and Missions**

**April 2005**

---

**1. Postsecondary Education -- Mission and Scope.**

From time to time, the Board adopts a formal statement of mission and scope for postsecondary education, incorporating both academic and vocational elements. Any alteration of this statement is subject to Board approval. The official copy of the Board-approved "Mission and Scope Statement for Postsecondary Education" is kept on file at the Office of the State Board of Education.

**2. Institutions -- Role and Mission.**

From time to time, the Board adopts a formal statement of role and mission for each institution. Any alteration of these statements is subject to Board approval. An official copy of each institution's statement is kept on file in the office of the chief executive officer of the institution and at the Office of the State Board of Education and is published in the institution's catalogue.

**3. Procedural Requirements.**

Any proposal to add to, delete from, or alter a Board-approved mission-and-scope statement or an institutional role-and-mission statement will be submitted to the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee, then to the Presidents' Council, for review and recommendation prior to Board consideration. However, the Board reserves the right to revise either the mission and scope statement or an institutional role and mission statement on its own initiative and at its discretion.

**4. Institutional Long-Range Plans.**

Consistent with the institutional statement of role and mission adopted by the Board and the Board's statement of mission and scope, each institution develops a strategic plan outlining long-range goals, short-range objectives, and implementation strategies for responding to the needs of its constituents. The plan must receive prior Board approval, must be updated annually to reflect any fiscal or other constraints and opportunities, and must be linked to the institution's program-review and budget-request processes. Major elements of the plan will include the environment within which the institution operates; identification of institutional priorities; program-review process recommendations as the basis for

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

program development, expansion, or realignment; and measures to ensure quality, efficient use of state resources, and responsiveness to clients.

5. Statewide Long-Range Plan.

Consistent with its statement of mission and scope, the Board will develop a strategic plan outlining the goals, objectives, and implementation strategies necessary for the responsible management of the state system of postsecondary education. Updated periodically to reflect fiscal or other constraints and opportunities, the plan will be prepared by Board staff in consultation with the institutions and the Board's committees. The plan will be linked to the Board's budget-request process, and major elements of the plan will include the environment within which postsecondary education operates; identification of system priorities; and measures to ensure quality, efficient use of state resources, and responsiveness to the citizens of Idaho.

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

SUBSECTION: Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education

April 2005

---

**Z. Delivery of Postsecondary Education – Planning and Coordination of Academic Programs and Courses**

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that Idaho postsecondary institutions meet the educational and workforce needs of the state through academic planning, alignment of programs and courses, collaboration and coordination. It is the intent of the State Board of Education (the “Board”) to optimize the delivery of academic programs while allowing institutions to grow and develop consistent with an appropriate alignment of strengths and sharing of resources. This policy anticipates the use of academic plans to advise and inform the Board in its work to plan and coordinate educational programs in a manner that enhances access to quality programs and courses, while concurrently increasing efficiency, avoiding duplication and maximizing the cost-effective use of educational resources. As part of this process, the Board intends to more clearly identify, reinforce and strengthen the respective statewide missions of the institutions governed by the Board. The provisions set forth herein are intended to serve as fundamental principles underlying the delivery of postsecondary education pursuant to collaborative and cooperative agreements, or memorandums of understanding, between and among the institutions.

The Board acknowledges and supports the role of oversight and advisory councils to assist in coordinating, on an ongoing basis, the operational aspects of delivering postsecondary education within a service region in accordance with the terms of the memorandums of understanding entered into between the institutions and consistent with this policy.

This policy is not applicable to programs or courses offered at a distance through electronic means, correspondence or continuing education courses, or dual enrollment courses for secondary education.

1. Definitions

a. Statewide Mission

A statewide mission denotes that the institution is assigned by the Board to offer and deliver a program in order to meet a particular educational and workforce need in all regions of the state. A statewide mission describes an institution’s responsibility for instructional programs that are unique with regard to academic focus. A unique program or course is defined as an academic or vocational program or course, which is offered by and available at only one of the institutions under the governance of the Board. Statewide missions are assigned to institutions by the Board through the role and mission statements.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

b. Regional Mission

A regional mission describes an institution's responsibility for instructional programs pertaining to identified educational and workforce needs of primary service regions (identified in Section III, Subsection L. of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures). Because similar educational and workforce needs may exist in multiple service regions, programs that are part of an institution's regional mission may be duplicated by other institutions within other service regions.

2. Responsibilities Related to Statewide Missions

Programs/Courses Related to Statewide Missions

It is the responsibility of each institution assigned a statewide mission by the Board to assess and ensure the delivery of all statewide mission programs and courses necessary to meet the educational and workforce needs associated with the statewide mission throughout the state.

3. Responsibilities Related to Regional Missions

Programs/Courses Related to Regional Missions

It is the responsibility of each designated institution within a primary service region (identified in Section III, Subsection L. of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures) (a "designated institution") to assess and ensure the delivery of all educational programs, courses and services necessary to meet the educational and workforce needs within its primary service region. Delivery of educational programs and services will include the provision of programs and courses that are regional in nature by the designated institution and partnering institutions and the provision of programs and courses that are identified as statewide missions by institutions assigned a statewide mission responsibility.

4. Academic Planning Process

a. General Provisions

(1) Each institution will create and maintain an eight (8) year rolling, academic plan that describes the programs, courses and services to be offered by the institution and by other public, postsecondary institutions governed by the Board to respond to the educational and workforce needs of the state, or a service region, as appropriate (with respect to each institution, the "Plan"). Plans should be developed pursuant to a process of collaboration and communication with and among the other institutions within the state.

(2) Plans will be submitted to the Office of the Idaho State Board of Education ("OSBE") for review and approval by the Idaho State Board of Education (the

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

“Board”) in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board (the “CAO”). Plans will be submitted first to the Council for Academic Affairs and Programs (“CAAP”) at least sixty (60) days prior to submission to OSBE for review, discussion and coordination among CAAP members. Upon submission of the Plans to OSBE, the CAO will review the Plans for the purpose of optimizing through collaboration and coordination among the institutions the cost-effective delivery of quality programs and courses, access to such programs and courses, the avoidance of duplication of programs and courses and the efficient use of resources. The CAO will provide recommendations to the Board for enhancements, if any, to the Plans, no later than thirty (30) days prior to approval by the Board. The Plans will be used to advise and inform the Board in its work to plan and coordinate educational programs throughout the state. Each institution will be responsible for updating its Plan as follows:

- (a) Plans pertaining to the delivery of programs and courses for baccalaureate degrees and postgraduate degrees will be updated and submitted to CAAP and OSBE every two (2) years in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO and in accordance with the timelines set forth above.
- (b) Plans pertaining to the delivery of programs and courses for associate level degrees or professional-technical degrees or certificates may be updated and submitted to CAAP and OSBE on an as needed basis in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO. Plans for these programs and courses will be approved by the CAO.
- (3) The CAO will develop an academic plan form to be used by institutions as a guide for providing the information requested herein.

b. Statewide Mission Planning Process

(1) Statewide Mission Plan

Each institution assigned a statewide mission will create and maintain a Plan that describes the programs and services to be offered to respond to the workforce and educational needs of the state relating to the institution’s statewide mission. Each plan will include at least the following:

- (a) A needs assessment that identifies the ongoing and future workforce and educational needs of the state relating to the institution’s statewide mission.
- (b) A description of the statewide mission programs and courses to be delivered throughout the state by the mission owning institution and the resources to be employed.
- (c) A description of the statewide mission programs and courses offered, or to be offered, by institutions not assigned the statewide mission.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

(d) A summary of the terms of memorandums of understanding (“MOU”s), if any, entered into between the statewide mission owning institution and partnering institutions pursuant to Section 4 below. If it is anticipated that the program or course will be offered within three (3) years of approval of the Plan, the description will include a summary of the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery of the programs and courses, including facility needs and costs.

(2) Statewide Mission Program or Course in a Service Region

If a statewide mission owning institution identifies a need for the delivery of a statewide mission program or course within a service region, and that program or course is not identified, or anticipated to be identified, by the designated institution in its Plan, the statewide mission owning institution will communicate with the designated institution (in accordance with a schedule to be determined by the CAO) for the purpose of including the same in the designated institution’s Plan. It is intended that statewide mission programs or courses be included in the designated institution’s Plan, as updated, and that the statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution collaborate and coordinate during the planning process. To facilitate this process, the statewide mission owning institution will deliver to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution and OSBE a description of the program or course intended to be delivered, including a plan for the delivery of the program or course, a timeline for delivery of the program or course, the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery, including facilities needs and costs.

(3) MOU with Designated Institution

If an institution having a statewide mission program or course has submitted the information set forth in Subsection 2 above to a designated institution and OSBE in a timely manner (in accordance with a schedule determined by the CAO) for inclusion in the designated institution’s Plan, then the designated institution will identify the program or course in its Plan and enter into an MOU with the statewide mission owning institution for the delivery of such program or course in accordance with this policy. If, prior to the submission of an updated Plan by the designated institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program or course in the service region, then upon Board approval the statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution will enter into an MOU for the delivery of such program or course in accordance with the provisions of this policy.

c. Regional Planning Process

(1) Designated Institution Plan

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

The designated institution in a primary service region (identified in Section III, Subsection L. of the Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures) will create and maintain a Plan that describes the programs and courses to be offered to respond to the educational and workforce needs of its primary service region. It is intended that designated institutions communicate and collaborate with other institutions located outside of the service region in developing its Plan. If, in the course of developing or updating its Plan, the designated institution identifies a need for the delivery of a program or course within its service region, and the designated institution is unable to provide the program or course, the designated institution will coordinate with an institution located outside of the service region (a “partnering institution”) to deliver the program or course in the service region. This will be done pursuant to an MOU to be entered into between the designated institution and the partnering institution in accordance with Section 4 below. Each Plan developed by a designated institution will include at least the following:

- (a) A needs assessment that identifies the ongoing and future workforce and educational needs of the region.
  - (b) A description of the academic programs and courses to be delivered in the service region, or outside of the service region, by the designated institution and the resources to be employed.
  - (c) A description of regional mission programs and courses offered, or to be offered, in the service region by partnering institutions, including any anticipated transition of programs or courses to the designated institution.
  - (d) A description of statewide mission programs and courses to be offered in the service region by the statewide mission owning institution or by the designated institution.
  - (e) A summary of the terms of MOUs, if any, entered into between the designated institution and partnering institutions pursuant to Section 4 below. If it is anticipated that the program or course will be offered within three (3) years of approval of the Plan, the description will include a summary of the anticipated costs of delivery and the resources and support required for delivery of the programs and courses, including facility needs and costs.
- (2) Program and Course Offerings by Partnering Institutions

If a partnering institution identifies a regional mission program or course not identified, or anticipated to be identified, in the designated institution’s Plan, and the partnering institution wishes to offer such program or course in the service region, the partnering institution may communicate with the designated institution for the purpose of including the program or course in the designated institution’s Plan. In order to include the program or course in the designated institution’s

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Plan, the partnering institution must demonstrate the need within the service region for delivery of the program or course, as determined by the Board (or by the CAO in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses). In order to demonstrate the need for the delivery of a program or course in a service region, the partnering institution will complete and submit to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution, to CAAP and to OSBE, in accordance with a schedule to be developed by the CAO, the following:

- (a) A study of business and work force trends in the service region indicating anticipated, ongoing demand for the educational program or course to be provided.
  - (b) A survey of potential students evidencing demand by prospective students and attendance sufficient to justify the short-term and long-term costs of delivery of such program or course.
  - (c) A complete description of the program or course requested to be delivered, including a plan for the delivery of the program or course, a timeline for delivery of the program or course, the anticipated costs of delivery, the resources and support required for delivery (including facilities needs and costs), and program or course syllabuses.
- (3) Designated Institution's Opportunity to First Offer a Program or Course

If,

- (a) (i) the partnering institution has submitted the information set forth in Subsection 2 above to the Chief Academic Officer of the designated institution in a timely manner (in accordance with a schedule to be determined by the CAO) for inclusion in the designated institution's Plan, (ii) a need is demonstrated by the partnering institution for such program or course in the service region, as determined by the Board (or by the CAO in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses); or
- (b) Prior to the submission of an updated Plan by the designated institution, it is determined by the Board that an emergency need has arisen for such program or course in the service region, then, the designated institution must within six (6) months (three (3) months in the case of associate level or professional-technical level programs or courses) determine whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms (qualitatively and quantitatively) described by the partnering institution. In the event the designated institution determines not to offer the program or course, the partnering institution may offer the program or course according to the terms stated, pursuant to an MOU to be entered into with the designated institution. If the partnering institution materially changes the terms and manner in which the program or course is to be delivered, the partnering institution will provide notice to the Chief

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Academic Officer of the designated institution and to the CAO of such changes and the designated institution will be afforded the opportunity again to review the terms of delivery and determine within three (3) months of the date of notice whether it will deliver such program on substantially the same terms.

d. Program Transitions

In order to appropriately balance (i) the ability of institutions to grow and develop programs and courses in accordance with their statewide mission or according to their service region mission, (ii) the desire that programs and courses be delivered to meet workforce and educational needs, and (iii) the reduction of costs and alignment of educational resources, it is the intent of the Board that, to the extent possible, designated institutions, partnering institutions and statewide mission owning institutions plan and coordinate the delivery of programs and courses anticipated to be offered by such institutions, but not currently identified in the designated institution's, partnering institution's or statewide mission owning institution's Plans. This should be achieved first in the process of developing an institution's Plan.

In the event (i) a statewide mission owning institution intends to develop the capacity to offer a statewide mission program or course within a service region currently being offered by the designated institution or a partnering institution, or (ii) a designated institution intends to develop the capacity to offer a program or course that is being offered within its service region by a partnering institution (other than a program or course offered by a statewide mission owning institution), the statewide mission owning institution or designated institution, respectively, will identify its intent to develop the program or course in the next update of its eight (8) year Plan.

- (a) In order for the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, to offer a program or course that is currently offered by another institution (the "withdrawing institution"), the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, must demonstrate its ability to offer the program or course.
- (b) Except as otherwise agreed between the institutions pursuant to an MOU, the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, will allow the withdrawing institution a minimum three (3) year transition period (thus creating three (3) to five (5) years' notice pursuant to a two (2) year update process) to allow the withdrawing institution to withdraw its program or course. If, upon notice from the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, the withdrawing institution wishes to withdraw its program or course region prior to the end of the three (3) year transition period, the withdrawing institution will seek to enter into a transition MOU with the statewide mission owning institution, or the designated institution, as appropriate, to begin delivery by the statewide mission owning institution or designated institution at a date prior to the end of the three (3) year transition period, but in no event earlier than two (2) years from the date of notice (unless otherwise agreed by the statewide mission owning

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

institution or designated institution). Included within the transition MOU will be an admissions plan between the institutions providing for continuity in student enrollment during the transition period.

e. Discontinuance of Offerings

Unless otherwise agreed between a statewide mission owning institution and the designated institution pursuant to an MOU, if, for any reason, a designated institution offering programs or courses in its service region that supports a statewide mission program of another institution, wishes to discontinue the offering(s), the designated institution will use its best efforts to provide the statewide mission owning institution at least one (1) year's written notice of withdrawal. The designated institution will also submit the same written notice to the State Board of Education and to oversight and advisory councils. In such case, the statewide mission owning institution will carefully evaluate the workforce need associated with such program or course and determine whether it is appropriate pursuant to its regional mission to provide such program or course. In no event will the statewide mission owning institution be required to provide such offering(s).

Unless otherwise agreed between the partnering institution (whether statewide mission owning, or otherwise) and the designated institution pursuant to an MOU, if, for any reason, a partnering institution offering programs or courses in a service region wishes to discontinue the offering(s), the partnering institution will use its best efforts to provide the designated institution at least one (1) year's written notice of withdrawal. The partnering institution will also submit the same written notice to the State Board of Education and to oversight and advisory councils. In such case, the designated institution will carefully evaluate the workforce need associated with such program or course and determine whether it is appropriate pursuant to its regional mission to provide such program or course. In no event will the designated institution be required to provide such offering(s).

f. Existing Programs

Programs and courses being offered by a partnering institution (whether statewide mission owning, or otherwise) in a service region prior to July 1, 2003, may continue to be offered pursuant to an MOU between the designated institution and the partnering institution, subject to the transition and notice periods and requirements set forth above.

g. Applicability of Section III. G. – Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance

The requirements of this Subsection 4. Academic Planning Process relating to the approval and discontinuance of programs and courses are intended to apply in addition to the requirements of Section III. G. – Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance. To the extent the provisions of Section III. G. – Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance are not inconsistent with the provisions of this

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Subsection 4. Academic Planning Process, such provisions will remain in full force and effect. In the event of conflict, the provisions set forth herein will apply.

5. Memorandums of Understanding

- a. A memorandum of understanding (“MOU”) is an agreement between two or more institutions offering programs or courses within the same service region that details how such programs and courses will be delivered in a collaborative manner. An MOU is intended to provide specific, practical details that build upon what has been provided in each institution’s eight (8) year, academic plan. When a service region is served by more than one institution, an MOU will be developed between such institutions as provided herein and submitted to OSBE for review and approval by the Board.
- b. Each MOU is to be entered into based on the following guidelines, unless otherwise approved by the Board:
  - (1) For programs and courses offered by a partnering institution (whether a statewide mission owning institution, or otherwise) within a municipal or metropolitan area that encompasses the campus of a designated institution:
    - (a) Offerings will be conducted in facilities located on the campus of the designated institution to the extent the designated institution is able to provide adequate and appropriate facilities (taking into account financial, resource, and programmatic considerations), or in facilities immediately adjacent to the campus of the designated institution. Renting or building additional facilities will be allowed only upon Board approval, based on the following: (i) the educational and workforce needs of the local community demand a separate facility as demonstrated in a manner similar to that set forth in Subsection 4.c.(2) above, and (ii) the use or development of such facilities are not inconsistent with the designated institution’s eight (8) year plan.
    - (b) Facilities rented or built by a partnering institution (whether a statewide mission owning institution, or otherwise) on, or immediately adjacent to, the “main” campus of a designated institution may be identified (by name) as a facility of the partnering institution, or, if the facility is rented or built jointly by such institutions, as the joint facility of the partnering institution and the designated institution. Otherwise, facilities utilized and programs offered by one or more partnering institutions within a service region will be designated as “University Place at (name of municipality).”
    - (c) Program or course offerings will not duplicate those currently offered at the campus of the designated institution. If courses necessary to complete a program are offered by the designated institution, they will be used and articulated into the program.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

(d) For programs and courses offered by a partnering institution (whether a statewide mission owning institution, or otherwise) within a municipality or metropolitan area encompassing a campus of a designated institution, to the extent programmatically possible, auxiliary services (including, but not limited to, bookstore, conference and other auxiliary enterprise services) and student services (including, but not limited to, library, information technology, and other auxiliary student services) will be provided by the designated institution. To the extent programmatically appropriate, registration services will also be provided by the designated institution. It is the goal of the Board that a uniform system of registration ultimately be developed for all institutions governed by the Board. The designated institution will offer these services to students who are enrolled in programs or courses offered by the partnering institution in the same manner, or at an increased level of service, where appropriate, as such services are offered to the designated institution's students. The MOU between the designated institution and the partnering institution will outline how costs for these services will be allocated.

6. Oversight and Advisory Councils

The Board acknowledges and supports the role of oversight and advisory councils to assist in coordinating, on an ongoing basis, the operational aspects of delivering programs and courses among multiple institutions in a service region, including necessary resources and support and facility services, and the role of such councils in interacting and coordinating with local and regional advisory committees to address and communicate educational needs indicated by such committees. Such interactions and coordination, however, are subject to the terms of the MOUs entered into between the institutions and the policies set forth in this Section III, Subsection Z.

7. Resolutions

All disputes relating to items addressed in this policy will be forwarded to the CAO for review. The CAO will prescribe the method for resolution. The CAO may forward disputes to CAAP and if necessary make recommendation regarding resolution to the Board. The Board will serve as the final arbiter of all disputes.

8. Reporting

Once annually, OSBE, with appropriate input from the each institution, will develop a report of programs offered at all sites throughout the state by Board governed institutions, along with a summary of academic plans and MOUs.

9. Exceptions

This policy does not apply to courses and programs specifically contracted to be offered to a private, corporate entity. However, in the event that an institution plans to contract with a corporate entity outside of their designated regional assignment, the contracting

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

institution will notify the designated institutions in the service region and institutions holding a statewide mission, as appropriate. If the corporate entity is located in a municipality that encompasses the campus of a designated institution, the Board encourages the contracting institution to include and draw upon the resources of the designated institution insomuch as is possible.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Reconsideration of Idaho State University's Mission Statement

**REFERENCE**

October 11-12, 2007      ISU's proposed mission statement was shared with the Board. The Board wanted to have a more detailed discussion at the December meeting.

**APPLICABLE, RULE, STATUTE, POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.I. Roles and Missions

**BACKGROUND**

Per policy, the State Board of Education "adopts a formal statement of role and mission for each institution." Any alteration must have Board approval.

Idaho State University (ISU) has developed a mission statement to promote their university. This mission statement and ISU's current Board adopted role and mission statement can be located in Attachment 1.

**DISCUSSION**

The Board considered if the proposed mission statement was intended to replace the formal "Mission and Scope" statement adopted by the Board, or whether the mission statement was a separate statement. The discussion included a question if the Board had inadvertently "approved" two differing mission statements by approving ISU's strategic plan at a previous meeting, which contained the mission statement now under consideration.

**IMPACT**

None: Academic programming and planning are conducted toward alignment with the formal role and mission statements approved by the Board.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – ISU's Proposed Mission Statement

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The statement presented by ISU is not consistent with the format used in Board Policy III.I. The statement is presented in a format and style more often seen in strategic planning and marketing materials.

Review of Board Policy III.I provides only contextual definitions for the terms, scope, role, and mission. Board Policy III.Z utilizes the term "mission" over 60 times at various levels, such as "statewide mission" and "regional mission". The Board has reserved the right to modify an institution's statements concerning mission, role, and scope at any time.

Two options become evident. One option is to revise Board policies III.I and III.Z to allow institutions to develop mission statements consistent with formal Board statements on institutional role and scope. The revised policies would direct formal Board statements into terms other than "Mission" and require institutions to develop and present new "mission statements" for Board approval, either as

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

stand alone statements or as a required part of the institutions' strategic plans. This will provide institutions with greater flexibility and improve the quality of strategic plans submitted for Board approval.

Another option is to direct ISU to remove the term "mission" from the proposed statement, replacing it with language that has not been reserved by the Board in policy.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion to postpone approval of the Idaho State University mission statement until revised policy language is approved by the Board.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

OR

A motion to direct ISU remove the term "mission" from the presented statement and replace it with language that does not use terms reserved by the Board as seen in Board Policies III.I and III.Z.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 1**

**Idaho State University's Mission Statement**

*"The mission of Idaho State University is to advance scholarly and creative endeavors through the creation of new knowledge, cutting-edge research, innovative artistic pursuits and high-quality academic instruction; to use these qualities to enhance technical, undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, health care, and other services provided to the people of Idaho, the Nation, and the World; and to develop citizens who will learn from the past, think critically about the present, and provide leadership to enrich the future in a diverse, global society."*

**Idaho State University's Role and Mission Statement Adopted by the Board**

1. Type of Institution

Idaho State University is a doctoral university serving a diverse population through research, state and regional public service, undergraduate and graduate programs. The university also has specific responsibilities in delivering programs in the health professions.

Idaho State University will formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on health professions, the related biological and physical sciences, and teacher preparation. Idaho State University will give continuing emphasis in the areas of business, education, engineering, technical training and will maintain basic strengths in the liberal arts and sciences, which provide the core curriculum or general education portion of the curriculum.

2. Programs and Services\*

Baccalaureate Education: Offers a wide range of baccalaureate degrees and qualified professional programs.

Graduate: Offers a wide range of masters, doctoral and professional programs consistent with state needs.

Associate Education: Offers a wide range of associate degrees and qualified professional programs

Research: Conducts coordinated and externally funded research studies

Technical and Workforce Training: Offers a wide range of vocational, technical and outreach programs

Certificates/Diplomas: Offers a wide range of certificates, and diplomas

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Continuing Education: Provides a variety of life-long learning opportunities

Distance Learning: Uses a variety of delivery methods to meet the needs of diverse constituencies

3. Constituencies Served

The institution serves students, business and industry, the professions and public sector groups throughout the state and region as well as diverse and special constituencies. Idaho State University works in collaboration with other state and regional postsecondary institutions in serving these constituencies.

\* Programs and Services are listed in order of emphasis.

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

**Idaho State Board of Education  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

**I. Roles and Missions**

April 2005

---

1. Postsecondary Education -- Mission and Scope.

From time to time, the Board adopts a formal statement of mission and scope for postsecondary education, incorporating both academic and vocational elements. Any alteration of this statement is subject to Board approval. The official copy of the Board-approved "Mission and Scope Statement for Postsecondary Education" is kept on file at the Office of the State Board of Education.

2. Institutions -- Role and Mission.

From time to time, the Board adopts a formal statement of role and mission for each institution. Any alteration of these statements is subject to Board approval. An official copy of each institution's statement is kept on file in the office of the chief executive officer of the institution and at the Office of the State Board of Education and is published in the institution's catalogue.

3. Procedural Requirements.

Any proposal to add to, delete from, or alter a Board-approved mission-and-scope statement or an institutional role-and-mission statement will be submitted to the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee, then to the Presidents' Council, for review and recommendation prior to Board consideration. However, the Board reserves the right to revise either the mission and scope statement or an institutional role and mission statement on its own initiative and at its discretion.

4. Institutional Long-Range Plans.

Consistent with the institutional statement of role and mission adopted by the Board and the Board's statement of mission and scope, each institution develops a strategic plan outlining long-range goals, short-range objectives, and implementation strategies for responding to the needs of its constituents. The plan must receive prior Board approval, must be updated annually to reflect any fiscal or other constraints and opportunities, and must be linked to the institution's program-review and budget-request processes. Major elements of the plan will include the environment within which the institution operates; identification of institutional priorities; program-review process recommendations as the basis for

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

program development, expansion, or realignment; and measures to ensure quality, efficient use of state resources, and responsiveness to clients.

5. Statewide Long-Range Plan.

Consistent with its statement of mission and scope, the Board will develop a strategic plan outlining the goals, objectives, and implementation strategies necessary for the responsible management of the state system of postsecondary education. Updated periodically to reflect fiscal or other constraints and opportunities, the plan will be prepared by Board staff in consultation with the institutions and the Board's committees. The plan will be linked to the Board's budget-request process, and major elements of the plan will include the environment within which postsecondary education operates; identification of system priorities; and measures to ensure quality, efficient use of state resources, and responsiveness to the citizens of Idaho.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

New Instructional Unit: The Musculoskeletal Research Institute – Boise State University

**APPLICABLE, RULE, STATUTE, POLICY**

- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.G. 4 and 5 Program Approval and Discontinuance
- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.W.3.c
- Higher Education Research Council, Bylaws and Policies Manual, VIII. Research Center Grants

**BACKGROUND**

Boise State University (BSU) proposes to formally establish the Musculoskeletal Research Institute, which combines the strengths of existing specialized laboratories on campus to address a collaborative research focus. This effort will provide the foundation for a focused, but comprehensive, approach in the area of musculoskeletal research, with the mission of improving diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of conditions, which are of significance in pediatric and aging populations.

**DISCUSSION**

Activity in skeletal research at BSU includes the nano-molecular investigation of biochemical processes important in skeletal development, the development of novel diagnostic and therapeutic strategies for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders, and the characterization and imaging of full body skeletal movement and dynamics. Developing as an emerging strength within the State of Idaho, this focused effort has the potential for obtaining national recognition in the future.

The proposed collaborative research focus in musculoskeletal biology and orthopedics will support parallel expansion of educational training programs at BSU. Recruitment of talented students and new faculty will depend upon the quality, productivity, and reputation of the associated research.

Partnerships with Idaho-INBRE, researchers at the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, the VA Medical Research Center, Intermountain Orthopedics, St. Luke's Children's Hospital, College of Idaho, and Northwest Nazarene University also express a commitment to the institute by regional researchers and clinicians. A substantial increase in extramural funding will be realized in Idaho as the research teams further develop and disseminate research results. Business development opportunities in the bioscience and biomedical industries within Idaho will provide a significant economic impact to the State.

To assure timely progress and meet the goal of submitting subsequent applications for federal support of future research, the management committee will monitor progress in each of the projects at its monthly meetings. Future

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

activities will be focused through an annual assessment process. In addition to self-assessment of the institute by its members, external review of research strengths and weaknesses will be requested.

Other centers with a biomedical research focus exist at Idaho's universities but none have a theme of musculoskeletal research with a focus on osteoarthritis. This effort does not duplicate any existing center/institute in the State of Idaho, and works in partnership with other centers and programs at ISU and UI.

The proposed focus on musculoskeletal research at BSU takes advantage of recent external funding sources that have been used to generate a critical mass of researchers with shared interest and expertise, and the establishment of core laboratory facilities.

**Fiscal Impact**

Estimated Fiscal Impact	FY 08	FY 09	FY 10	Total	Annual Projection Post-HERC
<b>A. Expenditures</b>					
1. Personnel	197,900	202,515	178,695	579,110	195,000
2. Operating	135,087	131,295	154,508	420,890	115,000
3. Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0
4. Facilities	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>332,987</b>	<b>333,810</b>	<b>333,203</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>
<b>B. Source of Funds</b>					
1. Appropriated Reallocation					30,000
2. Appropriated – New					
3. Federal					95,000
4. Other ***	332,987	333,810	333,203	1,000,000	185,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>332,987</b>	<b>333,810</b>	<b>333,203</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>
<b>C. Nature of Funds</b>					
1. Recurring *					310,000
2. Non-recurring **	332,987	333,810	333,203	1,000,000	310,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>332,987</b>	<b>333,810</b>	<b>333,203</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>	<b>310,000</b>

\* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become the base.

\*\* Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

\*\*\* Source of funds for the first three years: Center Grant Award from the Idaho State Board of Education-Higher Education Research Council (HERC)

\*\*\*\*The HERC grant will fund the Institute for three years. This column shows a projection of annual expenses and sources of funds for the years that follow the end of the HERC grant. The projected sources of funds are as follows:

- o Indirect cost recovery pay for service contracts, for administrative assistance, and for a portion of one technician: \$70,000 annually

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

- Grants will pay for one technician, undergraduate stipends, supplies: \$95,000
- Reallocation of state funds will pay for a portion of graduate student costs: \$30,000
- Gifts will pay for a portion of graduate student costs: \$30,000
- A recharge center will pay for one technician: \$85,000

**IMPACT**

If Board approved, the institution will implement this program and it will be subject to future monitoring for program compliance.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Notice of Intent

Page 3

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Center for Musculoskeletal Research is a HERC recommended and Board approved research center under Board Policy III.W.3.c. HERC Policy VIII. emphasizes “Center funds are intended to build existing programs to bring them into national prominence and self-sufficiency.” The Board approved funding of one million dollars over three years at the Board’s June 2007 meeting.

BSU’s internal policies utilizes the term “Institute” for those projects involving multiple colleges on campus. Board Policy III.G.2.b., identifies an “Institute” as an “instructional unit.” Establishment of an instructional unit provides an institution an organizational infrastructure component that provides for the addition of new programs and degrees within an area of study.

Any new programs or degrees brought in under the proposed institute must be supported from resources other than the funds provided under the HERC research proposal and are subject to review under Board Policy III.G. as appropriate. The budget presented reflects the HERC funds through the first three years and the plans for continued support post-HERC. Since the funding amount exceeds the policy established limit for Executive Director approval (\$250,000) the request has been referred to the Board. Staff recommends approval.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion to approve the establishment of the Musculoskeletal Research Institute at Boise State University as presented.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
NOTICE OF INTENT**

**To initiate a New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or  
Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit**

Institution Submitting Proposal: Boise State University

Name of College, School, or Division: Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Education

Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Departments of Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Kinesiology, Physics, Mathematics, Computer Science, Mechanical and Biomedical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Materials Science and Engineering.

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program  
 Academic x Professional - Technical \_\_\_\_\_

A New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:  
Musculoskeletal Research Institute  
 (Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: Fall 2007

**For New Programs:**

**For Other Activity:**

Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000

Alan Koutie  
CoED

Mary  
CoAS

Cheryl B. Schrader  
CoEN

- Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
- Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
- Instructional/Research Unit
- Addition/Expansion
- Discontinuance/consolidation
- Contract Program
- Other ME

College Deans (Institution) 9/12/07 Date

Stacy Pearson 9/14/07  
Date

Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) 9/12/07 Date

Mr. A. Andersen 9/12/07  
Date

Chief Academic Officer (Institution) 9/12/07 Date

[Signature] 9/12/07  
Date

President

VP Research & Graduate Studies 9/13/07 Date

State Administrator, SDPTE 10-30-07 Date

[Signature] 10-30-07  
Date

Chief Academic Officer, OSBE

SBOE/OSBE Approval

**Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance.**

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

The Musculoskeletal Research Institute (MRI) is a new entity and combines the strengths of existing specialized laboratories on the Boise State University campus to address a collaborative research focus. This effort will provide the foundation for a focused but comprehensive approach in the area of musculoskeletal research, with the mission of improving diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of conditions, which are of significance in both the pediatric and the aging population. Three of the four core competencies identified by the Idaho Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council are addressed within this research effort; 1) Imaging, 2) Nano-technology, and 3) Biosciences. This effort represents a unique collective of instrumentation, intellectual expertise, and research facilities, driven by a dedication to the highest quality of research training and education in musculoskeletal research spanning all levels of complexity; from the nanometer scale investigation of the structure and function of molecular components of the skeletal system, to the macro scale analysis and biomechanical characterization of human movement.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. **Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.** (Use additional sheets if necessary).

Within the spectrum of challenges that will be addressed is the identification of early indicators of the onset of osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis (OA) is a disease that results in the breakdown of articular cartilage in joints. The incidence of arthritis and the associated costs to society are staggering. Forty-three million people in the United States suffer from some form of arthritis, causing it to be the leading cause of disability in our country. Greater than 30% of the population over the age of 65 suffers from OA, and since that population is rapidly increasing in number as the baby boomers age, osteoarthritis will soon account for 30% of all medical office visits. The national cost of arthritis in the US is estimated at 124.8 billion dollars annually when medical payments, lost productivity, and lost resources are considered. Even more shocking is that medical care for all persons with arthritis accounted for 2.8% of the gross national product in 1996.

In Idaho the statistics are no less grim. According to the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare's "*Arthritis in Idaho 2001 Report*," 36.4% of Idaho adults have arthritis. People who have arthritis report an average of 8.8 unhealthy days in the past month compared to 4.2 unhealthy days in people without arthritis. This, along with direct medical costs, leads to an annual cost of \$362 million for the State of Idaho due to arthritis. That value is expected to increase over the next 15 years. By the year 2020, it is estimated that 265,000 Idahoans will have arthritis, up from 236,000 Idahoans who currently suffer from arthritis ("*Idaho's Arthritis Action Plan November 2000*, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare).

Activity in skeletal research at Boise State University includes the nano-molecular investigation of biochemical processes important in skeletal development, the development of novel diagnostic and therapeutic strategies for the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders, and the characterization and imaging of full body skeletal movement and dynamics. Developing as an emerging strength within the state of Idaho, this focused effort has the potential for obtaining national recognition in the future.

The proposed collaborative research focus in musculoskeletal biology and orthopaedics will support parallel expansion of educational training programs at Boise State University. Recruitment of talented students and new faculty will depend upon the quality, productivity, and reputation of the associated research. Boise State University has historically placed emphasis on the quality of teaching and will continue to do so as course offerings are expanded to accommodate new graduate programs in areas supported by this endeavor.

Partnerships with Idaho-INBRE, researchers at the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, the VA Medical Research Center, Intermountain Orthopedics, St. Luke's Children's Hospital, Albertson College of Idaho, and Northwest Nazarene University also express a commitment to the institute by regional researchers and clinicians. This collaborative focus in musculoskeletal research will yield information about the mechanisms of musculoskeletal diseases, and contribute to the development of improved diagnostic techniques and more effective therapeutic and preventative strategies. A substantial increase in extramural funding will be realized in Idaho as the research teams further develop and disseminate research results. Business development opportunities in the bioscience and biomedical industries within Idaho will provide a significant economic impact to the State.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

To assure timely progress, and to meet the goal of submitting subsequent applications for federal support of future research, the management committee will monitor progress in each of these projects at its monthly meetings. Future activities will be focused through an annual assessment process. In addition to self-assessment of the institute by its members, external review of research strengths and weaknesses will be requested.

Benchmarks of success will include: 1) an increase in the number of grant applications submitted to support musculoskeletal research, 2) an increase in grant funding for musculoskeletal research from extramural sources, 3) the number and quality of undergraduate and graduate students receiving degrees and training in musculoskeletal research, and 4) the number and quality of publications and presentations at state, regional, national, and international professional meetings.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.

While other centers with a biomedical research focus exist at Idaho's universities, none have a theme of musculoskeletal research with a focus on osteoarthritis. The true strength of the proposed approach is that we will be able to address specific musculoskeletal health issues at all levels of scale, from biomolecular to biomechanical. In addition, the use of bioinformatics to detect novel therapeutic targets at the genomic and proteomic levels adds strength to this proposal. Imaging and analysis capabilities provided by the TEM, SEM, AFM and laser scanning confocal microscope also provide the instrumentation necessary to explore the research questions in a specific and detailed manner.

The proposed focus on musculoskeletal research at Boise State University takes advantage of recent external funding sources that have been used to generate a critical mass of researchers with shared

interest and expertise, and the establishment of core laboratory facilities. Today, musculoskeletal research is a multidisciplinary field, requiring expertise from numerous academic departments, including biology, chemistry, kinesiology, physics, mathematics, computer science, mechanical and biomedical engineering, electrical and computer engineering, and materials science and engineering. It is widely accepted that breakthroughs and discoveries in biomedical research will require multidisciplinary teamwork and collaborative research programs. The infrastructure of an institute with a collaborative research focus will facilitate access to essential instrumentation and equipment for all associated researcher partners. This effort does not duplicate any existing center/institute in the State of Idaho, and in fact works in partnership with other centers and programs at Idaho State University and University of Idaho.

Outreach to research partners will be a critical effort of this institute, with an emphasis on collaboration with scientists at other universities in Idaho. Facilities will be available for use by researchers at Albertson College of Idaho, Northwest Nazarene University, Mountain States Tumor and Medical Research Institute, the VA Medical Research Center, Intermountain Orthopedics, St. Luke's Children's Hospital, Idaho State University and University of Idaho.

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)  
 By Institution for the Proposed Program  
 Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

**NOT APPLICABLE**

Institution	Relevant Enrollment Data			Number of Graduates		
	Current	Previous Year	Previous Year	Current	Previous Year	Previous Year
BSU						
CSI						
EITC						
ISU						
LCSC						
NIC						
UI						

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

**NOT APPLICABLE**

Institution and Degree name	Level	Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)	Specializations offered within the degree at the institution
BSU			
CSI			

EITC			
ISU			
LCSC			
NIC			
UI			

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The following are quotes from the Idaho State Board of Education's mission statement for Boise State University. The portions that are relevant to the proposed Institute are bolded. Note the solid connection between the statements below and the purposes of the proposed Institute, which are to facilitate research and to support the growth of graduate programs.

*"Boise State University is a comprehensive, urban university serving a diverse population through undergraduate and **graduate programs, research, and state and regional public service.**"*

*"Boise State University will formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on business and economics, **engineering...**"*

*"Boise State University will give continuing emphasis in the areas of the **health professions, the physical and biological sciences...**"*

*"Graduate: Offers a variety of masters and **select doctoral degrees consistent with state needs.**"*

*"**Research: Conducts coordinated and externally funded research studies.**"*

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

Yes  No

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

Institutes are not listed on the 8-year plan

8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

Estimated Fiscal Impact	FY _____	FY _____	FY _____	Total
<b>A. Expenditures</b>				
1. Personnel	197,900	202,515	178,695	579,110
2. Operating	135,087	131,295	154,508	420,890
3. Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0
4. Facilities	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>332,987</b>	<b>333,810</b>	<b>333,203</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>
<b>B. Source of Funds</b>				
1. Appropriated-reallocation				
2. Appropriated – New				
3. Federal				
4. Other:***	332,987	333,810	333,203	1,000,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>				
<b>B. Nature of Funds</b>				
1. Recurring *				
2. Non-recurring **	332,987	333,810	333,203	1,000,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$332,987</b>	<b>\$333,810</b>	<b>\$333,203</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>

\* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.

\*\*Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

\*\*\*Source of funding: Centers Grant from the Idaho Higher Education Research Council

Addendum  
Rec'd 10/24/07  
P8

8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

Estimated Fiscal Impact	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	Annual Projection post-HERC****
<b>A. Expenditures</b>				
1. Personnel	197,900	202,515	178,695	195,000
2. Operating	135,087	131,295	154,508	115,000
3. Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0
4. Facilities	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>332,987</b>	<b>333,810</b>	<b>333,203</b>	<b>310,000</b>
<b>B. Source of Funds</b>				
1. Appropriated-reallocation				30,000
2. Appropriated – New				
3. Federal				95,000
4. Other:***	332,987	333,810	333,203	185,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>				<b>310,000</b>
<b>B. Nature of Funds</b>				
1. Recurring *				310,000
2. Non-recurring **	332,987	333,810	333,203	
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$332,987</b>	<b>\$333,810</b>	<b>\$333,203</b>	<b>310,000</b>

\* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.

\*\* Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

\*\*\*Source of funds for first three year: Centers Grant from the Idaho Higher Education Research Council (HERC)

\*\*\*\*The HERC grant will fund the Institute for three years. This column shows a projection of annual expenses and sources of funds for the years that follow the end of the HERC grant. The projected sources of funds are as follows:

- Indirect cost recovery pay for service contracts, for administrative assistance, and for a portion of one technician: \$70,000 annually
- Grants will pay for one technician, undergraduate stipends, supplies: \$95,000
- Reallocation of state funds will pay for a portion of graduate student costs: \$30,000
- Gifts will pay for a portion of graduate student costs: \$30,000
- A recharge center will pay for one technician: \$85,000

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**REFERENCE:      APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

G. Program Approval and Discontinuance

April 2005

---

**4. Program Approval Policy**

Program approval will take into consideration statewide and institutional objectives.

a. New instructional programs, instructional units, majors, minors, options, and emphases require approval prior to implementation;

(1) Board Approval – Board approval prior to implementation is required for any new:

(a) academic professional-technical program, new major, minor, option, emphasis, or instructional unit with a financial impact\* of \$250,000 or more per year;

(b) graduate program leading to a master's, specialist, or doctoral degree.

(2) Executive Director Approval – Executive Director approval prior to implementation is required for any new academic or professional-technical program, major, minor, option, emphasis or instructional unit with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 per year.

b. Existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases and instructional units.

(1) Changes, additions, expansions, and consolidations to existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases, or instructional units with a financial impact of \$250,000 or more per year require Board approval prior to implementation.

(2) Changes, additions, expansions, and consolidations to existing instructional programs, majors, minors, options, emphases or instructional units with a financial impact of less than \$250,000 require executive director approval prior to implementation. The executive director may refer any of the requests to the Board or a subcommittee of the Board for review and action. All modifications approved by the executive director shall be reported quarterly to the Board. Non-substantive name or title changes need not be submitted for approval.

c. Routine Changes

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Non-substantive changes, credits, descriptions of individual courses, or other routine catalog changes do not require notification or approval. Institutions must provide prior notification of a name or title change for programs, degrees, departments, divisions, colleges, or centers via a letter to the Office of the State Board of Education.

**5. Approval Procedures**

a. Board Approval Procedures

- (1) Subsequent to institutional review and consistent with institutional policies, all requests requiring Board approval will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent in a manner prescribed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board.
- (2) The Chief Academic Officer shall forward the request to the CAAP for its review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests will be forwarded to the Idaho Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action. If the CAAP recommends approval, the proposal shall be forwarded to the Board for action. Requests that require new state appropriations will be included in the annual budget request of the institution and the State Board of Education.
- (3) CAAP may, at its discretion, request a full proposal for any request requiring a notice of intent. A request for a new graduate program requires a full proposal. Full proposals should be forwarded to CAAP members at least two (2) weeks prior to the next CAAP meeting for initial review prior to being forwarded to the Board for approval.
- (4) As a part of the full proposal process, all doctoral program request(s) will require an external peer review. The external peer-review panel will consist of at least two (2) members and will be selected by the Board's Chief Academic Officer and the requesting institution's Chief Academic Officer. The review will consist of a paper and on-site review followed by the issuance of a report and recommendations by the peer-review panel. Considerable weight on the approval process will be placed upon the peer reviewer's report and recommendations.

b. Office of the State Board of Education Approval Procedures

- (1) All requests requiring approval by the Executive Director will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent in a manner prescribed by the Chief Academic Officer of the Board. At the discretion of the Chief Academic Officer, the request may be forwarded to the CAAP for review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests will be forwarded to the Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

(2) If the CAAP recommends approval of the request(s), the notice of intent will be submitted to the Executive Director for consideration and action. The Executive Director shall act on any request within thirty (30) days of receipt of the Chief Academic Officer's or CAAP's recommendation.

(3) If the Executive Director denies the request he or she shall provide specific reasons in writing. The institution has thirty (30) days in which to address the issue(s) for denial of the request. The Executive Director has ten (10) working days after the receipt of the institution's response to re-consider the denial. If the Executive Director decides to deny the request after re-consideration, the institution may send its request and the documents related to the denial to the president of the Board for final reconsideration.

(4) Distance Learning Delivery and Residence Centers

All academic programs delivered to sites outside of the service area defined by the institution's role and mission statement shall be submitted to the Executive Director using a notice of intent.

**Idaho State Board of Education  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**

**W. Higher Education Research Council**

April 2005

---

3. Specific funding programs to strengthen research in Idaho.

c. Research Centers.

Many important advances can only be made with the establishment of focused research centers. Centers typically involve at least three faculty members in conjunction with the necessary research equipment and support personnel. The funds needed to establish centers of this type are large and, in all probability, no more than one such center per year should be established in Idaho. Minimal state funding of \$250,000 per center per year for at least three years is essential to enable centers to become nationally competitive. This is clearly a minimal amount which should be supplemented by non-state matching funds. Multiple year funding is essential for the establishment of these centers.

**Higher Education Research Council**

**Bylaws and Policy Manual**

**VII. RESEARCH CENTER GRANTS**

---

The Research Center Grant Program (RCGP) is designed to provide funds to established research centers which enable researchers to make important advances that cannot be made readily by other approaches. Center funds are intended to build existing programs to bring them into national prominence and self-sufficiency.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Higher Education Research Council Appointments

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section III.W. 4, Higher Education Research Council Policy

**BACKGROUND**

The Higher Education Research Council (HERC) is responsible for implementing and administering the Board's Higher Education Research Council Policy and the grant programs created by it, which are designed to stimulate competitive research at Idaho's institutions. HERC has worked diligently to attract projects that serve to strengthen the research capabilities and contribute to the economic development of the State of Idaho. HERC's annual budget has averaged approximately \$2 million over the past ten years.

**DISCUSSION**

The Higher Education Research Council is comprised of the Presidents of the State College and Universities, four non-institutional representatives and the Governor's Statewide Science & Technology Advisor. The terms for two of the non-institutional representative positions, currently held by Dr. Dennis Stevens and Mr. John Huffman, expire in December 2007. The term of appointment for non-institutional positions is three years.

Dr. Stevens and Mr. Huffman have expressed interest in continuing their service on the Higher Education Research Council. As a form of standard practice, the Board has requested that staff obtain nominations for all Board appointments. Therefore, nominations were solicited from the four-year institutions. The following are biographical summaries for the Board's consideration.

**Dennis Stevens** is an internationally recognized scholar in infectious diseases and is currently the Chief of Infectious Diseases Section at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Boise. Dr. Stevens was appointed to HERC in 1995 and reappointed in subsequent years for three-year terms. Dr. Stevens is heavily involved in research in his capacity at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center. He strongly believes in cultivating partnerships between institutions and the private sector and initiated a collaborative program that provided Idaho Microbiology students with the opportunity to complete research projects in his laboratory at the VA Medical Center.

**John Huffman** received his B.S. degree from Oklahoma State University, and his M.S. in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Idaho, specializing in composite materials design. Mr Huffman worked as an R&D Development engineer, R&D Project Manager and campus recruiter for Hewlett Packard for 26 years. As an R&D Project Manager John worked closely with Japanese companies developing new HP Color LaserJet printers for worldwide markets and has twenty three patents. John retired from HP in 2005 and currently runs

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Counterpoint Software, a web design and consulting service, and is Chairman of the iEterna Foundation, Inc.

**David Tuthill** is currently the Executive Director of the Idaho Department of Water Resources and has held various administrative positions with that agency since 1976. That agency has contracted with all three Idaho universities to lead and conduct research projects that are vital to helping the agency complete its mission, and effectively manage one of Idaho's critical resources. Dr. Tuthill has 30 years of commissioned service: active reserve and retired as a Colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army Reserve, on July 1, 2004. Dr. Tuthill received his B.S. degree in Agricultural Engineering from Colorado State University and his M.S. degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Colorado. His Ph.D. degree in Civil Engineering was obtained from the University of Idaho.

**IMPACT**

N/A

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff has no comments or recommendations.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion to appoint \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ to the Higher Education Research Council respectively for three-year terms, December 2007 – December 2010.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

Idaho State Board of Education

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

SUBSECTION: W. Higher Education

April 2005

---

4. State Research Council

The State Board of Education shall appoint the four non-institutional representatives and a representative from the Office of Science and Technology who shall serve as an ex officio member with voting privileges. The chairman of the committee will be elected by the Council annually. Term length for the non-institutional members is three years.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Native-American Higher Education Committee Update

**BACKGROUND**

In June 2007, the State Board of Education established a Native-American Higher Education Committee, a new advisory group to the Board on Native-American access issues to higher education. Board member Laird Stone serves as the chair and Superintendent Tom Luna is co-chair of the committee.

**DISCUSSION**

Board members, with input from staff, solicited nominations from the Provosts and Chief Academic Officers at the public institutions. Twelve individuals representing Idaho's postsecondary and secondary schools as well as state agencies were identified to serve on this committee.

The committee held its first meeting on October 10, 2007 in Lewiston, and is scheduled to meet in Boise on December 3, 2007.

**IMPACT**

Members and guests at the first meeting agreed that there are barriers to access and support for Native Americans in relation to post-secondary education.

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The membership agreed to provide SBOE staff a listing of currently available programs and supports, along with the respective funding sources and program end dates (if applicable). SBOE staff will prepare a compilation of the information for the members as an aid to the continuing discussion.

**BOARD ACTION**

This item is for informational purposes only. Any action will be at the Board's discretion.

**THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Idaho/Washington Reciprocity Agreement

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures, Section V. T. 2.d.
- Section 33-3717C. Waiving Fees or Tuition for Certain Nonresident Students, Idaho Code

**BACKGROUND**

For well over a decade the Idaho State Board of Education and the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) have had a tuition reciprocity agreement that enhances access to educational opportunities for residents of Idaho and Washington at reduced tuition rates. The current two-year agreement expired on June 30, 2007.

**DISCUSSION**

Under the terms of the 2005-2007 agreement, the Board and the HECB agree to waive nonresident tuition charges in the total amount of \$850,000  $\pm$  \$500 on an academic year basis at each participating institution as follows:

Idaho Institution Amount Waived		Washington Institution Amount Waived	
Boise State University	\$ 93,500	Walla Walla Community College	\$ 420,000
Idaho State University	\$ 93,500	Eastern Washington University	\$ 430,000
University of Idaho	\$433,500		
Lewis Clark State College	\$229,500		
<b>Total Waived</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>	<b>Total Waived</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>

A representative from the HECB contacted the Board office and has inquired if Idaho is interested in renewing the reciprocity agreement for another two years for the same dollar amount each year as indicated above. At the meeting of the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee held on November 1, 2007, the University of Idaho, Lewis-Clark State College, Boise State University, and Idaho State University expressed interest in renewing the agreement for another two years at the same amounts as per the previous agreement.

**IMPACT**

Renewal of the reciprocity agreement provides a cost-effective way for Idaho and Washington students to attend an out-of-state institution at reduced tuition rates. Attachment 1 illustrates the amounts waived in 2006 and an estimate for 2007.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment 1 – Reciprocity Report Page 3  
Attachment 2 – ID/WA Reciprocity Agreement 2007-2009 Page 5

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Board staff recommends adding language to the agreement to request that the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board provide relevant data to the State Board of Education such as the exact number of Idaho students awarded

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

reciprocity waivers and the total amount waived. Board staff, CAAP, and IRSA recommends the renewal of the two-year reciprocity agreement between the State Board of Education and the Washington HECB.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion to approve the renewal of the two-year reciprocity agreement between the State Board of Education and the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board and direct the Executive Director to sign the agreement on the Board's behalf.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**Attachment 1**

**Washington/Idaho State Board of Education – Reciprocity Waivers**

**State of Idaho**

<b>Idaho Institution</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>No. of Students</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>No. of Students</b>
Boise State University	\$ 88,896	24	\$ 88,900	16
Idaho State University	\$ 77,000	20	\$ 77,000	9
University of Idaho	\$433,500	138	\$433,500	132
Lewis-Clark State College	\$140,582	129	\$140,600	109
<b>Total \$ Waived</b>	<b>\$739,978</b>		<b>\$740,000</b>	
<b>No. of WA students FT &amp; PT</b>		<b>311</b>		<b>266</b>

**State of Washington**

<b>Washington Institution</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
Eastern Washington University	\$430,000	\$430,000
Walla Walla Community College	\$420,000	\$420,000
<b>Total \$ Waived (approximate)</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>
<b>No of ID students FT &amp; PT (estimate)</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

Between

THE WASHINGTON HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD (HECB)  
For the State of Washington

and

THE IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (ISBOE)  
For the State of Idaho

WHEREAS, It is the objective of both the State of Washington and the State of Idaho to provide increased access to educational opportunities for bona fide residents of Idaho and Washington; and

WHEREAS, The Revised Code of Washington, Chapter 28B.15.750 authorizes the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to enter into an agreement with appropriate officials or agencies in Idaho to effect a student exchange program that would waive the payment of all or a portion of the nonresident tuition and fees differential for residents of Idaho; and

WHEREAS, Idaho Code Section 33-3717C authorizes the Idaho State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho collectively referred to as the ISBOE to enter into negotiations with the State of Washington to waive a portion of nonresident tuition for residents of the State of Washington; and

WHEREAS, It is the intent of the ISBOE to provide access to programs not currently available at Idaho institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, It is the intent of HECB to provide access opportunities to residents of all geographic regions of Washington; and

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

WHEREAS, It is the intent of both the HECB and the ISBOE prior to entering into said agreement to achieve an exchange of students which results in balanced or nearly balanced levels of foregone tuition and fees.

NOW, THEREFORE, The HECB and the ISBOE mutually agree as follows:

1. The State of Idaho, through the State Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho, will waive nonresident tuition charges in the total amount of \$850,000 ± \$500 on an academic year basis for Washington residents who are enrolled or are seeking enrollment on a full-time basis in baccalaureate and graduate degree program as follows: Boise State University -- \$93,500; Idaho State University -- \$93,500; Lewis-Clark State College -- \$229,500; and the University of Idaho -- \$433,500.

The number of students covered by this agreement and the amount waived per student are at the discretion of each participating institution.

2. The State of Washington, through the Boards of Regents and Trustees of the participating institutions, will waive a total of \$850,000 ± \$500 of nonresident tuition and fee differential charges on a academic year basis for Idaho residents who are enrolled or are seeking enrollment on a full-time basis in baccalaureate and graduate degree programs as follows: Eastern Washington University -- \$430,000; and Walla Walla Community College -- \$420,000. Walla Walla Community College shall give priority to students enrolled in programs of nursing at the Clarkston Center. The number of students covered by this agreement and the amount waived per student are at the discretion of each participating institution.

3. Washington institutions shall give first priority to waiving all or a portion of the nonresident tuition and fees differential for Idaho residents who are seeking enrollment or are currently enrolled in degree programs not available in Idaho according to the ISBOE Official Program and Degree Listing.

4. Idaho and Washington institutions shall give priority to currently enrolled students who meet or exceed institutional policies on satisfactory academic performance.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

5. Students participating in the reciprocity program must be bona fide residents of their home state and may not be seeking to establish a change in residency during the time they participate in the program; time accrued while participating in the reciprocity program will not contribute toward the length of residence required for residency status.

6. Institutions shall inform students of their policies on eligibility for renewal of waivers including a statement that all waivers are subject to continuance of the reciprocity agreement executed by the HECB and the ISBOE.

7. The HECB and the ISBOE agree to review the enrollment patterns related to reciprocity at participating institutions annually to consider the level of participation for the next academic year. The HECB and the ISBOE shall develop common criteria for identifying data to be provided by participating institutions as necessary to this agreement for collection and analysis for the HECB and the ISBOE.

8. The HECB and the ISBOE have developed the 2007 - 2009 agreement to be financially balanced, consistent with the intent of Revised Code of Washington (28B.15.752). While each state will endeavor to manage waivers to the amounts set forth in sections 1 and 2 of this agreement, no balancing adjustments need be made during the course of the agreement and, should participation levels not be realized, no provisions for payment of any imbalance has been agreed to by the parties to the agreement.

This agreement shall be effective after midnight, July 1, 2007, and shall continue until June 30, 2009, with the expectation that the review of the annual activities will be made by December 31, 2008. Either the HECB or the ISBOE with six (6) months' notice may terminate this agreement.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

Any notice given in connection with this agreement shall be given in writing and shall be delivered by hand to the other party or by normal U.S. Postal Service delivery to the other party at the following address:

Idaho State Board of Education  
650 W. State Street  
PO Box 83720  
Boise ID 83720-0037

Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board  
917 Lakeridge Way  
PO Box 43430  
Olympia WA 98504-3430

IDAHO

WASHINGTON

THE IDAHO STATE  
BOARD OF EDUCATION

THE WASHINGTON STATE HIGHER  
EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike Rush  
Interim Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ann Daley  
Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

**Idaho State Board of Education**  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES  
**SECTION: V. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**  
**Subsection: T. Fee Waivers**

April 2002

---

- 2. Waiver of Nonresident Tuition
  - d. Reciprocity with the State of Washington

Based on a limit approved by the Board, waivers may be allocated on an annual basis by the executive director to the college and universities in postsecondary education programs for Washington residents. An equal number of opportunities shall be afforded to Idaho residents in Washington postsecondary institutions.

**Idaho Statutes**

**TITLE 33  
EDUCATION  
CHAPTER 37  
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING  
TO STATE INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING**

**33-3717C. WAIVING FEES OR TUITION FOR CERTAIN NONRESIDENT STUDENTS. (1)**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law the state board of education and the board of regents of the university of Idaho may determine when to grant a full or partial waiver of fees or tuition charged to nonresident students pursuant to reciprocal agreements with other states. In making this determination, the state board of education and the board of regents of the university of Idaho shall consider the potential of the waiver to:

- (a) Enhance educational opportunities for Idaho residents;
- (b) Promote mutually beneficial cooperation and development of Idaho communities and nearby communities in neighboring states;
- (c) Contribute to the quality of educational programs; and
- (d) Assist in maintaining the cost effectiveness of auxiliary operations in Idaho institutions of higher education.

(2) Consistent with the determinations made pursuant to subsection (1) hereof, the state board of education and the board of regents of the university of Idaho may enter into agreements with other states to provide for a full or partial reciprocal waiver of fees or tuition charged to students. Each agreement shall provide for the numbers and identifying criteria of students, and shall specify the institutions of higher education that will be affected by the agreement.

(3) The state board of education and the board of regents of the university of Idaho shall establish policy guidelines for the administration by the affected Idaho institutions of any tuition waivers authorized under this section, for evaluating applicants for such waivers, and for reporting the results of the reciprocal waiver programs authorized in this section.

(4) A report and financial analysis of any waivers authorized under this section shall be submitted annually to the legislature as part of the budget recommendations of the state board of education and the board of regents of the university of Idaho for the system of higher education in this state.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

Federal Academic Competitiveness Grant Program – Idaho’s proposal for a rigorous high school program of study and the National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) Grants

**REFERENCE**

June 14 – 16, 2006                      Board approved Idaho’s proposal for a rigorous high school program of study

**APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

- Idaho Code 33-110.1. AGENCY TO NEGOTIATE, AND ACCEPT, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE
- Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures Section III.Q.

**BACKGROUND**

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) implemented two new student grant programs titled the Academic Competitiveness Grant Program (AC Grants) and the National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) Grants in February 2006 for implementation beginning with the 2006-2007 academic years. These federal programs are funded at \$4.5 billion between 2006 and the 2011 years. These programs provide aid to low-income college students who meet general Pell Grant program guidelines, as well as additional specified criteria. AC Grants are awarded to first and second-year college students who have successfully completed a rigorous secondary school program. The SMART grants are awarded to third and fourth-year college students enrolled in eligible science, mathematics, and foreign language majors.

The U.S. Department of Education identified four existing programs that they will accept as evidence of rigor in a secondary school program of study for the AC Grants. The DOE allowed the State Educational Agency (SEA) to request recognition for an alternative rigorous secondary school program of study for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years. The DOE has provided states with an additional opportunity to make changes to the program of study identified as rigorous for the purposes of qualifying for AC Grants. States may chose to add programs per federal guidelines, delete programs, or retain the existing programs with no changes.

**DISCUSSION**

A review of the initial student participation for the 2006-2007 academic year shows that students attending Idaho public and private institutions were awarded more than five million dollars in additional federal aid. Attachment 1 shows the distribution and participation of students in Idaho, and the data for the United States.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

The Idaho SBOE Admission Policy for Idaho's Public College and Universities (Regular Admission Policy) does assist students in preparing for college by providing the minimum admission guidelines for Idaho's public four-year institutions. The courses required by the Regular Admission Policy are more rigorous than current high school graduation requirements for Idaho. In addition, the course requirements in Idaho's Regular Admission Policy are similar to the "Set of course requirements similar to the State Scholars Initiative" approved by Secretary Spellings for the 2006-07.

The U.S. Department of Education provided an opportunity for states to propose alternate programs for consideration during the first two years of the program implementation. Idaho made a proposal based upon the Idaho College Admission Core. This was approved by the Secretary of Education in 2006. Attachment 2 shows Idaho's Approved Program of Study. In order for Idaho students to benefit from an alternate proposal for Idaho, a proposal was developed, and presented to the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) for the June 1, 2006 meeting. Once approved by CAAP the proposal was submitted electronically to the DOE. The SBOE approved the proposal at the June 14-16, 2006 meeting. The DOE has provided the opportunity for states to alter their initial proposal by adding programs, removing programs, or maintaining the current state proposal. At the November 1, 2007 CAAP meeting, the Provosts discussed this issue and determined that it is currently in the best interest of Idaho students to retain the existing approved proposal. They did comment that using the Idaho Admissions Core as the basis for Idaho's alternative proposal for the AC Grants is the minimum level of rigor that is acceptable. They recommended that we review the concept of establishing an Honor Diploma or another more rigorous standard in the future.

**IMPACT**

These U.S. Department of Education grant programs provide funding to eligible students through the 2011 academic year. Based on 2006 data from the U.S. Department of Education, 42% of undergraduates in Idaho are Pell recipients. First and second year Pell students who meet the eligibility requirements may benefit from this additional federal grant. A qualifying first-year student will receive \$750 and second-year students will receive \$1300. Many of these college bound students might qualify under Idaho's alternative proposal that would not otherwise qualify. No additional state funds are required for Idaho students to participate in this federal program. Eligible student receive additional federal funds to be used toward the cost of their postsecondary education. Staff recommends no changes to Idaho's proposal.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| Attachment 1 –Academic Competitiveness Grant and National SMART Grant Program summary for Idaho and the United States | Page 5  |
| Attachment 2 – Proposal for Idaho Alternative Rigorous Secondary  | Page 13 |

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

School Program of Study for the Academic  
Competitiveness Grant program  
Attachment 3 – Comparison of ACG/SMART and Pell Eligibility

Page 15

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Board Staff recommends that the Idaho SBOE support retaining the Idaho Admission Policy for consideration of a rigorous program of study for the Federal Academic Competitiveness Grant program.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion for the Board to ratify the proposal submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in 2006 as the rigorous secondary school program of study for Idaho to meet the requirement for the Academic Competitiveness Grant program.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

Idaho  
2006-2007

Academic Competitiveness Grant and  
National SMART Grant Programs

<b>IDAHO</b>
<b>\$1,474,914 in Academic Competitiveness (AC) Grants awarded to 1,916 students</b>
<b>\$3,592,053 in National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) Grants awarded to 1,088 students</b>
<b>For AC and National SMART Grants, students must 1) apply for financial aid by submitting the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and be determined to be eligible for a Federal Pell Grant; 2) be a U.S. citizen; 3) be enrolled in a two- or four-year degree program; and 4) be enrolled full-time.</b>
<b>The following are Idaho's pre-approved rigorous high school programs of study students must complete to earn an Academic Competitiveness Grant:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A set of courses similar to the State Scholars Initiative;</li><li>• Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses and test scores;</li><li>• Idaho College Admission Core.</li></ul>
For more information about these programs visit: <a href="http://www.ed.gov/admins/finaid/about/ac-smart/2007/id07.doc">http://www.ed.gov/admins/finaid/about/ac-smart/2007/id07.doc</a>
<b>STUDENTS SHOULD SELF-IDENTIFY ON THE FAFSA THAT THEY TOOK ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS</b>

Academic Competitiveness and National SMART Grants were created by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Congress appropriated \$4.5 billion for the programs between 2006 and 2011.

**The Department of Education has set a goal to double the number of students receiving AC and National SMART Grants by 2010-11.** States, colleges, and high schools should promote AC and National SMART Grants because completing a rigorous high school program is the best way to increase college readiness, reduce remediation, and increase college completion rates for low-income students. Increased postsecondary attainment will help the United States compete in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In addition to the Pell Grant amount, **up to \$750** will be awarded to eligible first-year AC Grant students, and **up to \$1,300** to second-year AC Grant students. **Up to \$4,000** will be awarded to eligible National SMART grant students for each year in addition to the Pell Grant funds. *States and colleges can package these grants with the Pell Grant and state and institutional awards to provide low-income students an early commitment that if they complete high school and take challenging courses, college expenses can be fully paid.*



Top five schools in Idaho with the highest number of AC Grant recipients:	
1. Brigham Young University - Idaho	674
2. University of Idaho	478
3. Boise State University	384
4. Idaho State University	196
5. Lewis-Clark State College	74

Top five schools in Idaho with the highest number of National SMART Grant recipients:	
1. Brigham Young University - Idaho	537
2. Idaho State University	184
3. University of Idaho	152
4. Boise State University	147
5. Lewis-Clark State College	35

Idaho's Top National SMART Grant majors:	Top Foreign Languages:
1. Biological and Biomedical Sciences	1. N/A
2. Engineering	2. N/A
3. Computer Science	3. N/A

**High schools need to do a better job graduating more students on-time and ready for college and work. Nationally, 4% of low-income high school students complete a rigorous course of study.**

- 28.4% of first-time, full-time Pell recipients in Idaho received an AC Grant compared to 25.6% nationally. States with the highest rates of AC Grant participation among the eligible population include Nebraska (36.5%), Minnesota (34.1%), and Arkansas (31.1%).
- 5% of Idaho's recent high school graduates received an AC Grant compared to about 5.3% nationally.

The effort in the first year of implementation can be improved upon going forward. To do this, high school and postsecondary personnel, state policymakers, and access advocates should:

- 1. Know your state's approved programs of rigorous study.**
- 2. Accept the challenge to double the number of students in Idaho receiving AC and National SMART Grants by 2010-11.**
- 3. Advocate for low-income students' access to rigorous, college preparatory classes, and pursuit of high-demand, high-wage majors in the National SMART Grant program.**



United States  
2006-2007

Academic Competitiveness Grant and  
National SMART Grant Programs

**UNITED STATES**

\$233,038,410 in Academic Competitiveness (AC) Grants awarded to 299,089 students

\$195,544,735 in National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) Grants awarded to 60,976 students

For AC and National SMART grants, students must 1) apply for financial aid by submitting the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and be determined to be eligible for a Federal Pell Grant; 2) be a U.S. citizen; 3) be enrolled in a two- or four-year degree program; and 4) be enrolled full-time.

The following are the Secretary's pre-approved rigorous high school programs of study students can complete to earn an Academic Competitiveness Grant:

- The State Scholars Initiative requirements.
- The student has completed a high school course of study with at least—
  - Four years of high school English;
  - Three years of high school math, including Algebra I and another higher level math course;
  - Three years of high school science, which must include two years of biology, chemistry or physics;
  - Three years of high school social studies; and
  - One year of high school foreign language.
- At least two Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses and test scores.

States may also submit additional programs of study for approval. For your state's approved programs visit:  
<http://www.ed.gov/admins/finaid/about/ac-smart/2007/a107.doc>

**STUDENTS SHOULD SELF-IDENTIFY ON THE FAFSA THAT  
THEY TOOK ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS**

Academic Competitiveness and National SMART Grants were created by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Congress appropriated \$4.5 billion for the programs between 2006 and 2011.

The Department of Education has set a goal to double the number of students receiving AC and National SMART grants by 2010-11. States, colleges, and high schools should promote AC and National SMART Grants because completing a rigorous high school program is the best way to increase college readiness, reduce remediation, and increase college completion rates for low-income students. Increased postsecondary attainment will help the United States compete in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In addition to the Pell Grant amount, **up to \$750** will be awarded to eligible first-year AC Grant students, and **up to \$1,300** to second-year AC Grant students. **Up to \$4,000** will be awarded to eligible National SMART grant students for each year in addition to the Pell Grant funds. *States and colleges can package these grants with the Pell Grant and State and institutional awards to provide low-income students an early commitment that if they complete high school and take challenging courses, college expenses can be fully paid.*



United States  
2006-2007

Academic Competitiveness Grant and  
National SMART Grant Programs

STATE	ACG Program		SMART Grant Program	
	RECIPIENTS	TOTAL DISBURSED	RECIPIENTS	TOTAL DISBURSED
Alabama	3,697	\$2,835,803	1,007	\$3,098,359
Alaska	60	\$43,373	63	\$204,327
Arizona	1,448	\$1,095,388	2,460	\$7,591,975
Arkansas	4,049	\$3,063,658	496	\$1,489,899
California	29,808	\$23,376,675	7,162	\$22,532,651
Colorado	2,981	\$2,314,696	1,375	\$4,390,894
Connecticut	1,836	\$1,531,646	292	\$967,104
Delaware	234	\$176,179	53	\$181,813
District of Columbia	1,083	\$958,091	133	\$485,063
Florida	16,270	\$11,948,147	2,644	\$8,085,749
Georgia	9,782	\$7,453,213	1,557	\$4,948,483
Hawaii	345	\$230,317	204	\$650,964
Idaho	1,916	\$1,474,914	1,088	\$3,592,053
Illinois	9,353	\$7,426,655	2,709	\$8,994,836
Indiana	8,521	\$6,656,111	1,215	\$3,737,577
Iowa	4,343	\$3,584,210	832	\$2,701,519
Kansas	2,997	\$2,463,473	688	\$2,128,485
Kentucky	5,405	\$4,093,931	826	\$2,725,227
Louisiana	6,446	\$4,816,553	954	\$3,034,635
Maine	1,694	\$1,373,295	227	\$786,557
Maryland	3,466	\$2,750,844	584	\$1,974,145
Massachusetts	8,438	\$7,165,041	1,336	\$4,775,424
Michigan	6,469	\$5,299,151	2,082	\$6,632,723
Minnesota	5,591	\$4,610,427	1,059	\$3,487,519
Mississippi	3,900	\$2,977,060	546	\$1,720,030
Missouri	5,325	\$4,242,149	1,163	\$3,699,162
Montana	1,003	\$786,501	384	\$1,247,635
Nebraska	3,071	\$2,461,156	367	\$1,134,082
Nevada	522	\$389,096	203	\$604,500
New Hampshire	1,195	\$1,009,072	195	\$676,663
New Jersey	5,867	\$4,164,988	835	\$2,854,029
New Mexico	1,083	\$797,187	499	\$1,448,334
New York	24,916	\$19,996,284	4,202	\$13,143,354
North Carolina	11,510	\$8,885,508	1,319	\$4,321,772
North Dakota	1,351	\$1,052,734	316	\$993,153
Ohio	14,467	\$11,114,321	1,877	\$5,857,850
Oklahoma	4,754	\$3,567,533	970	\$2,941,144
Oregon	2,318	\$1,836,362	1,106	\$3,423,172
Pennsylvania	18,944	\$14,963,404	2,856	\$9,500,360
Rhode Island	1,921	\$1,625,118	174	\$638,001
South Carolina	5,440	\$4,316,960	701	\$2,298,277
South Dakota	1,422	\$1,151,029	339	\$1,090,490
Tennessee	6,707	\$5,089,237	1,035	\$3,354,357
Texas	27,668	\$20,204,037	3,027	\$9,913,929
Utah	744	\$612,117	3,450	\$11,397,721
Vermont	896	\$756,858	142	\$511,981
Virginia	6,020	\$4,681,345	971	\$3,251,321
Washington	3,346	\$2,710,765	1,566	\$4,833,023
West Virginia	2,065	\$1,722,322	474	\$1,564,095
Wisconsin	6,049	\$4,926,247	1,129	\$3,669,905
Wyoming	353	\$257,227	84	\$258,417
<b>Total</b>	<b>299,089</b>	<b>\$236,038,410</b>	<b>60,976</b>	<b>\$196,544,736</b>



United States  
2006-2007

Academic Competitiveness Grant and  
National SMART Grant Programs

The Department of Education has set a goal to double the number of students receiving AC and SMART grants by 2010-11. To do this, the Department has compiled descriptions of common issues faced during the first year of implementation and how some innovative states and institutions addressed them.

*Issue:*

It is difficult for institutions to identify students who have taken a rigorous high school curriculum.

**Solution:** Institutions and states can establish a branded core curriculum for college admissions.

- University of California system: Four campuses of the University of California system are among the top 10 schools receiving AC Grants nationally. The University of California's A-G coursework requirements for admissions are well-known by high schools and students throughout the State. The A-G subject area requirements are approved as a course of study for Californian students to receive AC Grants and are also used for admissions by the California State University system.

**For more information visit:** <http://www.ucop.edu/a-gGuide/ag/faq.html>

**Solution:** The State can certify AC Grant eligibility by sending reports of eligible students to postsecondary institutions.

- Florida: Students graduating from eligible high schools in Florida who have earned the Bright Futures Scholarship have completed requisite test scores and GPA in the designated college preparatory curriculum. This curriculum portion of their award is an approved course of study in Florida to receive an AC Grant. The State informs colleges which students are scholarship recipients and maintains a website where institutions can identify Florida Bright Futures Scholars and therefore students who are potentially eligible for AC Grants.

**For more information visit:** <http://www.floridastudentfinancialaid.org/ssfad/bf/>

**Solution:** Institutions can reach out to all Pell Grant recipients, not just students who self-identify as eligible.

- Brigham Young University (BYU)—Idaho: BYU Idaho had 596 AC Grant recipients. To accomplish this, BYU Idaho conducted an exhaustive evaluation to identify AC Grant-eligible students by contacting all students who self-certified on their FAFSA and by contacting other students who appeared to be potentially eligible based on a review of transcripts and financial aid records.



United States  
2006-2007

Academic Competitiveness Grant and  
National SMART Grant Programs

**Issue:** It's a new program. How do we get the word out?

**Solution: Include AC Grants in existing state, local, and school-level outreach**

- Indiana Commission on Higher Education: Indiana provides an extensive college outreach program to every student in the state. The initiative, called Learn More Indiana, includes sending out magazines starting in eighth grade, a comprehensive website dedicated to information on going to college, and publications on paying for college. AC Grant and National SMART grants are presented as options in every contact with students and high school counselors.  
**For more information visit:** <http://www.learnmoreindiana.org/Pages/default.aspx>

**Issue:** Too few low income students are encouraged to take, or have the opportunity to take rigorous, college preparatory courses.

**Solution: Make a college preparatory course of study the default requirement for high school graduation**

- Arkansas Department of Education: Arkansas requires its high school graduates complete a college preparatory curriculum, branded as Smart Core. The Arkansas Department of Education hosted five regional summits across the State to explain the benefits of completing the Smart Core, including receiving additional federal financial aid through the Academic Competitiveness Grant program.  
**For more information visit:** [http://www.nextsteparkansas.org/educators/educators\\_what.html](http://www.nextsteparkansas.org/educators/educators_what.html)

**Solution: Amplify the incentive, and/or tie to a similar State financial aid program**

- Minnesota's new ACHIEVE scholarship: In 2007, Minnesota piggy-backed on the federal Academic Competitiveness Grant program and created the ACHIEVE Scholarship. The ACHIEVE scholarship provides low-income students who take a rigorous high school curriculum an extra \$1,200 to attend a college in Minnesota. The additional money serves to greatly increase the incentive to take a rigorous high school course of study.  
**For more information visit:** <http://www.getreadyforcollege.org/gPg.cfm?pageID=1789>

*Did you know students need to self-identify on the electronic FAFSA as having taken an approved rigorous course of study in high school? Make sure your high school students know which approved course of study they've completed and indicate it on the FAFSA.*



<b>Top five schools in the nation with the highest number of AC Grant recipients:</b>	
1. Pennsylvania State University	4,128
2. University of California – Davis	1,926
3. University of Texas – Austin	1,718
4. University of California – Los Angeles	1,686
5. Ohio State University	1,620

<b>Top five schools in the nation with the highest number of National SMART Grant recipients:</b>	
1. Brigham Young University	1,584
2. University of Phoenix	1,326
3. University of California – San Diego	921
4. Devry University	789
5. Pennsylvania State University	715

<b>The Nation's Top National SMART Grant majors:</b>	<b>Top Foreign Languages:</b>
1. Biological and Biomedical Sciences	1. Russian
2. Engineering	2. Japanese
3. Computer Science	3. Chinese

The effort in the first year of implementation can be improved upon going forward. To do this, high school and postsecondary personnel, State policymakers, and access advocates should:

- 1. Know your State's approved programs of rigorous study.**
- 2. Accept the challenge to double the number of students in your state receiving AC and National SMART grants by 2010-2011.**
- 3. Advocate for low-income students' access to rigorous, college preparatory classes, and pursuit of high-demand, high-wage majors in the National SMART program.** High schools need to do a better job graduating more students on-time and ready for college and work.
  - 4% of low-income high school students complete rigorous college preparatory courses.
  - 25% of first-time, full-time Pell recipients nationally received an AC Grant.



**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**Idaho**  
**Recognized Rigorous Secondary School Programs of Study**

The eligibility options for a student graduating from secondary school in Idaho during the 2007 calendar year are:

- ***A set of courses similar to the State Scholars Initiative.*** This program of study requires passing grades in the following:
  - Four years of English;
  - Three years of math (including Algebra I and a higher level course such as Algebra II, geometry, or data analysis and statistics);
  - Three years of science (including at least two courses from biology, chemistry or physics);
  - Three years of social studies; and
  - One year of a foreign language.
  
- ***Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses and test scores.*** This program requires a minimum of two Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses in high school and a minimum passing score on the exams for those classes. Students must score 3 or higher on AP exams and 4 or higher on IB exams.
  
- ***Idaho College Admission Core.*** This program requires:
  - Four years of English (composition, literature);
  - Three years of math (Algebra I and a higher level course such as Algebra II, Analytic Geometry, Calculus, Statistics and Trigonometry);
  - Three years of science (including at least two laboratory science classes from anatomy, biology, chemistry, earth science, geology, physiology, physics, physical science or zoology);
  - Two and one-half years of social studies;
  - One year of humanities or foreign language (inter-disciplinary humanities including literature, history, philosophy, and fine art). History courses beyond those required for the minimum social studies requirements may also count towards this category; and
  - One and one-half years of college preparation (including speech or debate, studio/performing arts or state approved professional-technical education classes). Foreign Language courses beyond those applied to the humanities/foreign language category may also count towards this category.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

ACG and SMART grants for 2006-07													
Recipients of New Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grants, by State													
State	ACG Program		SMART Grant Program		total ACG and SMART recipients	Number of Pell Recipients 2006-07	2006-07 # undergraduates	Percent of undergrads who got Pell	percent of undergrads who got ACG and SMART awards	percent of Pell recipients who got ACG or SMART	percent poverty in state	percent full time	
	Recipients	Total Disbursed	Recipients	Total Disbursed									
Alabama	3,697	\$2,835,803	1,007	\$3,098,359	4,704	96,204	218,372	44.1%	2.2%	4.9%	16.0%	67.5%	
Alaska	60	\$43,373	63	\$204,327	123	4,827	28,563	16.9%	0.4%	2.5%	9.4%	42.5%	
Arizona	1,448	\$1,095,388	2,460	\$7,591,975	3,908	221,972	410,416	54.1%	1.0%	6.9%	13.9%	61.9%	
Arkansas	4,049	\$3,063,658	496	\$1,489,899	4,545	56,705	125,636	45.1%	3.6%	8.0%	16.4%	66.3%	
California	29,808	\$23,376,675	7,162	\$22,532,651	36,970	554,452	2,107,426	26.3%	1.8%	6.7%	13.2%	50.7%	
Colorado	2,981	\$2,314,696	1,375	\$4,390,894	4,356	79,844	248,396	32.1%	1.8%	5.5%	9.9%	58.5%	
Connecticut	1,836	\$1,531,646	292	\$967,104	2,128	39,725	139,071	28.6%	1.5%	5.4%	9.1%	62.9%	
Delaware	234	\$176,179	53	\$181,813	287	8,936	41,907	21.3%	0.7%	3.2%	8.2%	64.1%	
District of Columbia	1,083	\$958,091	133	\$485,063	1,216	19,072	59,930	31.8%	2.0%	6.4%	16.7%	61.1%	
Florida	16,270	\$11,948,147	2,644	\$8,085,749	18,914	288,408	761,390	37.9%	2.5%	6.6%	12.2%	55.9%	
Georgia	9,782	\$7,453,213	1,557	\$4,948,483	11,339	176,230	377,266	46.7%	3.0%	6.4%	12.5%	67.2%	
Hawaii	345	\$230,317	204	\$650,964	549	10,739	58,025	18.5%	0.9%	5.1%	8.9%	60.0%	
Idaho	1,916	\$1,474,914	1,088	\$3,592,053	3,004	28,799	68,613	42.0%	4.4%	10.4%	10.0%	69.1%	
Illinois	9,353	\$7,426,655	2,709	\$8,994,836	12,062	208,086	667,249	31.2%	1.8%	5.8%	12.4%	56.1%	
Indiana	8,521	\$6,656,111	1,215	\$3,737,577	9,736	140,547	308,358	45.6%	3.2%	6.9%	10.8%	69.1%	
Iowa	4,343	\$3,584,210	832	\$2,701,519	5,175	84,022	193,908	43.3%	2.7%	6.2%	9.9%	66.8%	
Kansas	2,997	\$2,463,473	688	\$2,128,485	3,685	49,601	168,160	29.5%	2.2%	7.4%	11.1%	59.1%	
Kentucky	5,405	\$4,093,931	826	\$2,725,227	6,231	82,165	210,589	39.0%	3.0%	7.6%	16.0%	63.7%	
Louisiana	6,446	\$4,816,553	954	\$3,034,635	7,400	84,616	211,901	39.9%	3.5%	8.7%	16.8%	72.7%	
Maine	1,694	\$1,373,295	227	\$786,557	1,921	19,425	57,394	33.8%	3.3%	9.9%	11.6%	61.3%	
Maryland	3,466	\$2,750,844	584	\$1,974,145	4,050	67,633	252,340	26.8%	1.6%	6.0%	9.2%	53.0%	
Massachusetts	8,438	\$7,165,041	1,336	\$4,775,424	9,774	77,526	328,335	23.6%	3.0%	12.6%	9.7%	68.2%	
Michigan	6,469	\$5,299,151	2,082	\$6,632,723	8,551	186,371	529,083	35.2%	1.6%	4.6%	12.3%	57.9%	
Minnesota	5,591	\$4,610,427	1,059	\$3,487,519	6,650	79,355	280,739	28.3%	2.4%	8.4%	7.2%	64.5%	
Mississippi	3,900	\$2,977,060	546	\$1,720,030	4,446	73,495	135,449	54.3%	3.3%	6.0%	17.3%	76.5%	
Missouri	5,325	\$4,242,149	1,163	\$3,699,162	6,488	104,111	296,969	35.1%	2.2%	6.2%	11.5%	60.3%	
Montana	1,003	\$786,501	384	\$1,247,635	1,387	15,612	42,743	36.5%	3.2%	8.9%	14.6%	76.2%	
Nebraska	3,071	\$2,461,156	367	\$1,134,082	3,438	28,156	103,765	27.1%	3.3%	12.2%	9.6%	65.7%	
Nevada	522	\$389,096	203	\$604,500	725	16,139	95,563	16.9%	0.8%	4.5%	10.9%	47.4%	
New Hampshire	1,195	\$1,009,072	195	\$676,663	1,390	13,053	59,199	22.0%	2.3%	10.6%	5.6%	66.8%	
New Jersey	5,867	\$4,164,988	835	\$2,854,029	6,702	102,008	321,494	31.7%	2.1%	6.6%	8.3%	59.4%	
New Mexico	1,083	\$797,187	499	\$1,448,334	1,582	39,462	114,794	34.4%	1.4%	4.0%	17.3%	52.3%	
New York	24,916	\$19,996,284	4,202	\$13,143,354	29,118	364,965	914,620	39.9%	3.2%	8.0%	14.6%	70.0%	
North Carolina	11,510	\$8,885,508	1,319	\$4,321,772	12,829	144,063	417,786	34.5%	3.1%	8.9%	15.1%	63.4%	
North Dakota	1,351	\$1,052,734	316	\$993,153	1,667	12,661	44,774	28.3%	3.7%	13.2%	9.7%	76.5%	
Ohio	14,467	\$11,114,321	1,877	\$5,857,850	16,344	203,802	526,569	38.7%	3.1%	8.0%	11.3%	67.0%	

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

Okiahoma	4,754	\$3,567,533	970	\$2,941,144	5,724	71402	182,767	39.1%	3.1%	8.0%	11.8%	65.6%
Oregon	2,318	\$1,836,362	1,106	\$3,423,172	3,424	59418	174,619	34.0%	2.0%	5.8%	12.1%	61.1%
Pennsylvania	18,944	\$14,963,404	2,856	\$9,500,360	21,800	191527	571,322	33.5%	3.8%	11.4%	10.9%	71.8%
Rhode Island	1,921	\$1,625,118	174	\$638,001	2,095	21463	69,674	30.8%	3.0%	9.8%	11.5%	71.5%
South Carolina	5,440	\$4,316,960	701	\$2,298,277	6,141	74585	184,413	40.4%	3.3%	8.2%	13.8%	67.3%
South Dakota	1,422	\$1,151,029	339	\$1,090,490	1,761	16806	43,202	38.9%	4.1%	10.5%	13.0%	67.6%
Tennessee	6,707	\$5,089,237	1,035	\$3,354,357	7,742	104335	239,918	43.5%	3.2%	7.4%	15.0%	72.4%
Texas	27,668	\$20,204,037	3,027	\$9,913,929	30,695	406345	1,082,667	37.5%	2.8%	7.6%	16.7%	55.9%
Utah	744	\$612,117	3,450	\$11,397,721	4,194	56555	176,909	32.0%	2.4%	7.4%	9.5%	61.1%
Vermont	896	\$756,858	142	\$511,981	1,038	8620	33,313	25.9%	3.1%	12.0%	8.2%	72.0%
Virginia	6,020	\$4,681,345	971	\$3,251,321	6,991	98653	360,484	27.4%	1.9%	7.1%	9.7%	60.5%
Washington	3,346	\$2,710,765	1,566	\$4,833,023	4,912	82050	310,944	26.4%	1.6%	6.0%	12.0%	62.4%
West Virginia	2,065	\$1,722,322	474	\$1,564,095	2,539	36468	85,388	42.7%	3.0%	7.0%	15.8%	74.6%
Wisconsin	6,049	\$4,926,247	1,129	\$3,669,905	7,178	68145	293,127	23.2%	2.4%	10.5%	11.0%	63.9%
Wyoming	353	\$257,227	84	\$258,417	437	7508	30,337	24.7%	1.4%	5.8%	9.9%	57.5%
Total:	299,089	\$233,038,410	60,976	\$195,544,735								
Source: U.S. Education Department column A through H												
Source Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac 2006-07 columns I and M and N												

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**REFERENCE: APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY**

**TITLE 33  
EDUCATION  
CHAPTER 1  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

33-110. AGENCY TO NEGOTIATE, AND ACCEPT, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE. The state board is designated as the state educational agency which is authorized to negotiate, and contract with, the federal government, and to accept financial or other assistance from the federal government or any agency thereof, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by congressional enactment designed to further the cause of education.

**Idaho State Board of Education  
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES  
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS  
Q. Admission Standards**

**October 2002**

---

**Q. Admission Standards**

1. Coverage.

Boise State University, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, North Idaho College and The University of Idaho are included in this subsection. The College of Southern Idaho and North Idaho College are exempted from certain provisions of this admission policy as determined by their local boards of trustees.

2. Purposes.

The purposes of the admission policies are to:

- a. promote institutional policies which meet or exceed minimum statewide standards for admission to higher education institutions;
- b. inform students of the academic and applied technology degree expectations of postsecondary-level work;
- c. improve the quality of academic and applied technology degree preparation for postsecondary programs;
- d. enhance student access to academic and applied technology degree programs; and
- e. admit to postsecondary education institutions those students for whom there is a reasonable likelihood of success.

3. Policies.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

The college and universities must, with prior Board approval, establish institutional policies which meet or exceed the following minimum admission standards. Additional and more rigorous requirements also may be established by the college and universities for admission to specific programs, departments, schools, or colleges within the institutions. Consistent with institutional policies, admission decisions may be appealed by applicants to the institutional admissions committee.

4. Academic College and University Regular Admission.

A degree-seeking student with fewer than fourteen (14) credits of postsecondary work must complete each of the minimum requirements listed below. (International students and those seeking postsecondary professional-technical studies are exempt.)

a. Submit scores received on the ACT (American College Test) or SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) and/or other standardized diagnostic tests as determined by the institution. These scores will be required of applicants graduating from high school in 1989 or later. Exceptions include applicants who have reached the age of 21. These applicants are subject to each institution's testing requirements.

b. Graduate from an accredited high school and complete the courses below with a 2.00 grade point average. Applicants who graduate from high school in 1989 or later will be subject to the admission standards at the time of their graduation.

Subject Area	Minimum Requirement	Select From These Subject Areas
English	8 credits	Composition, Literature
Math	6 credits	<p>A minimum of six (6) credits, including Applied Math I or Algebra I; Geometry or Applied Math II or III; and Algebra II. A total of 8 credits are strongly recommended. Courses not identified by traditional titles, i.e., Algebra I or Geometry, may be used as long as they contain all of the critical components (higher math functions) prescribed by the State Mathematics Achievement Standards.</p> <p>Other courses may include Probability, Discrete Math, Analytic Geometry, Calculus, Statistics, and Trigonometry. Four (4) of the required mathematics credits must be taken in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grade.</p>
Social	5 credits	American Government (state and local), Geography, U.S.

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

Science		History, and World History. Other courses may be selected from Economics (Consumer Economics if it includes components as recommended by the State Department of Education), Psychology, and Sociology.
Natural Science	6 credits	Anatomy, Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, and Geology. Physiology, Physics, Physical Science, Zoology. A maximum of two (2) credits may be derived from vocational science courses jointly approved by the State Department of Education and the State Division of Professional-Technical Education, and/or Applied Biology, and/or Applied Chemistry. (maximum of two (2) credits). Must have laboratory science experience in at least two (2) credits. A laboratory science course is defined as one in which at least one (1) class period per week is devoted to providing students with the opportunity to manipulate equipment, materials, or specimens; to develop skills in observation and analysis; and to discover, demonstrate, illustrate, or test scientific principles or concepts.
Humanities Foreign Language	2 credits	Literature, History, Philosophy, Fine Arts (if the course includes components recommended by the State Department of Education, i.e., theory, history appreciation and evaluation), and inter-disciplinary humanities (related study of two or more of the traditional humanities disciplines). History courses beyond those required for state high school graduation may be counted toward this category.
Other College Preparation	3 credits	Speech or Debate (no more than one (1) credit). Debate must be taught by a certified teacher.  Studio/Performing Arts (art, dance, drama, and music).  Foreign Language (beyond any foreign language credit applied in the Humanities/Foreign Language category).  State Division of Professional-Technical Education-approved classes (no more than two (2) credits) in Agricultural science and technology, business and office education, health occupations education, family and consumer sciences

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

		education, occupational family and consumer sciences education, technology education, marketing education, trade, industrial, and technical education, and individualized occupational training
--	--	--

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**  
**DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**SUBJECT**

First Reading, Deletion of Board Policy III.D. Official Calendars

**BACKGROUND**

Currently the Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures Section *III.D., Official Calendars* requires that institutions submit to the Board office and share with Idaho institutions a copy of their official calendar “indicating significant dates and events (such as registration periods, vacations or holidays, and dates classes begin and end) occurring in the twelve-month period commencing with the fall. Calendars must also “indicate that classes will be held on state holidays designated for Columbus Day and Veterans Day and offices in the institutions will be open. . .”

Board policy also requires that “Each semester indicated in the Official Calendar of an institution will consist of seventeen (17) weeks with at least fifteen (15) full weeks or seventy-five (75) instructional days of class work or its equivalent effort.”

The schedule is reviewed and approved by the Chief Executive Officer of the institution “no later than October preceding the start of the planned academic year. Changes made by the Chief Executive Officer in the Official Calendar also will be distributed as specified above.”

**DISCUSSION**

On October 4, 2007 and November 1, 2007, the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) committee discussed the purpose of the policy and whether the requirement to submit the official calendar was still needed given that the calendars are now posted to respective institution websites. This led to a general discussion of the need for the current policy. Institutions noted that the definition in Board Policy is compatible with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) definition of time in a semester and requirements to have that information publicly available and easily accessible. With Idaho’s institutions accredited by NWCCU and meeting those requirements by posting their information online, the group felt the policy requirements would be a duplicative effort.

**IMPACT**

SBOE offices will no longer require paper copies of the institutional calendars be file at the SBOE office.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – First Reading- Deletion of Board Policy III.D. Page 3

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

IRSA, CAAP, and Board staff recommends the deletion of this policy given that calendars are posted to respective websites and that institutions are already required to meet NWCCU requirements.

**BOARD ACTION**

A motion to approve the deletion of Board Policy III.D. Official Calendars.

Moved by \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_ Carried Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, AND STUDENT AFFAIRS  
DECEMBER 6-7, 2007**

---

**Attachment 1**

Idaho State Board of Education

CAAP – Draft 10/22/07

**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS

SUBSECTION: D. Official Calendars

April 2005

---

**~~D. Official Calendars~~**

~~Each institution will prepare a schedule indicating significant dates and events (such as registration periods, vacations or holidays, and dates classes begin and end) occurring in the twelve-month period commencing with the fall. This schedule must be presented to the chief executive officer of the institution for "review and action" no later than October preceding the start of the planned academic year. This schedule will be designated the Official Calendar for the institution and will be distributed in October to the Office of the State Board of Education and the Idaho institutions specified in Subsection A. Changes made by the chief executive officer in the Official Calendar also will be distributed as specified above.~~

~~Each semester indicated in the Official Calendar of an institution will consist of seventeen (17) weeks with at least fifteen (15) full weeks or seventy-five (75) instructional days of class work or its equivalent effort.~~

~~Official calendars must indicate that classes will be held on state holidays designated for Columbus Day and Veterans Day and offices in the institutions will be open, with compensatory time provided at appropriate times within the academic calendar.~~

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**